

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Appellants: Close et al.)	Examiner:	N. Torres Velazquez
)		
Appl. No.: 10/748,454)	Group Art Unit:	1771
)		
Filed: December 30, 2003)	Deposit Acct. No.:	04-1403
)		
Title: "Nonwoven Webs Having Reduced Lint and Slough")	Confirmation No.:	2369
)		
)	Customer No.:	22827

RESPONSE TO NOTIFICATION OF NON-COMPLIANT APPEAL BRIEF

Honorable Commissioner for Patents
Post Office Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450


Honorable Commissioner:

In Response to the Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief dated August 15, 2007, Applicants respectfully submit the attached, revised Supplemental Appeal Brief identifying the claims on appeal.

Please charge any additional fees required by this Response to Deposit Account No. 04-1403.

Respectfully submitted,

DORITY & MANNING, P.A.



Neil M. Batavia
Registration No. 54,599

9/10/07
Date

P.O. Box 1449
Greenville, SC 29602
Telephone: (864) 271-1592
Facsimile: (864) 233-7342

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Appellants: Close et al.)	Examiner: N. Torres Velazquez
)	
Appl. No.: 10/748,454)	T.C./A.U.: 1771
)	
Filed: December 30, 2003)	Deposit Acct. No.: 04-1403
)	
Title: NONWOVEN WEBS HAVING)	Confirmation No.: 2369
REDUCED LINT AND SLOUGH)	
)	Customer No.: 22827

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF ON APPEAL

Honorable Commissioner for Patents
Post Office Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Honorable Commissioner:

Appellants submit the following brief on appeal in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §
41.37:

1. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest in this matter is the assignee of record, Kimberly-Clark
Worldwide, Inc.

2. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no other appeals or interferences known to the Appellants or the
Appellants' legal representative which will directly affect or be directly affected by or
have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

3. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-92 are pending in this application, including independent claims 1, 32, 55, and 77. Independent claims 1, 32, 55 and 77 are presently under appeal. All the claims are attached hereto as Exhibit A.

In the Final Office Action of May 30, 2006, all of the pending claims were finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

4. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

To the Appellants' knowledge, all amendments have been entered into the record.

5. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

In general, the present application is directed to nonwoven materials having reduced lint and slough. The nonwoven materials contain pulp fibers and, in accordance with the present application, include a meltblown "veneer" applied to at least one side of the material that has been found to greatly reduce lint and slough without substantially affecting the other properties of the material. Application, pg. 4, line 25.

Independent claim 1, for instance, is directed to a nonwoven web comprising pulp fibers. See, e.g., Pg.4, lines 23-29. The nonwoven web has a first side and a second side. See, e.g., Pg.5, lines 9-11. Meltblown fibers are applied to the first side of the web in a manner so as to reduce lint and slough. See, e.g., Pg.5, lines 11-12. The meltblown fibers are distributed over the surface of the first side of the nonwoven web

forming the first exterior surface of the nonwoven web and are present in an amount less than about 8 gsm. See, e.g., Pg.5, lines 13-15.

Independent claim 32 is directed to a tissue product comprising pulp fibers. See, e.g., Pg.5, lines 20-21. The nonwoven web has a first side and a second and opposite side. See, e.g., Pg.5, lines 22-23. Meltblown fibers are applied to the first side of the web in a manner so as to reduce lint and slough. See, e.g., Pg.5, lines 27-29. The meltblown fibers are distributed over the surface of the first side of the nonwoven web forming the first exterior surface of the nonwoven web and are present in an amount less than about 6 gsm. See, e.g., Pg.5, lines 15-18.

Independent claim 55 is directed to a coform web comprising pulp fibers and polymeric fibers. See, e.g., Pg.7, lines 21-22. The coform web has a first side and a second and opposite side. See, e.g., Pg.8, lines 1-5. The meltblown fibers are distributed over the surface of the first side of the coform web forming the first exterior surface of the coform web and are present in an amount less than about 8 gsm. See, e.g., Pg.5, lines 15-18.

Independent claim 77 is directed to a wet wipe stretch-bonded laminate comprising a first coform web, a second coform web, and an elastic layer positioned between the first coform web and the second coform web. See, e.g., Pg.7, line 20 – Pg. 8, lines 1-2. The first coform web defines a first exterior side of the stretch-bonded laminate and the second coform web defines a second exterior side of the stretch-bonded laminate. See, e.g., Pg.8, lines 2-5. Meltblown fibers are distributed over the surfaces of the first exterior side and the second exterior side of the stretch-bonded laminate, and are present in an amount less than about 8 gsm. See, e.g., Pg.5, lines

15-18. A wiping solution is impregnated into the stretch-bonded laminate. See, e.g., Pg.7, lines 19-20.

6. GROUND S OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

In the Final Office Action, independent claims 1, 32, and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,784,892 to Storey, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,177,370 to Skoog, et al.

Additionally, in the Final Office Action, independent claim 77 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,784,892 to Storey, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,177,370 to Skoog, et al. and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0127937 to Lange, et al. and WO 99/13860 to Richards.

7. ARGUMENT

Appellants respectfully submit that the presently pending claims are patentable over the cited references.

I. Independent claims 1, 32, and 55 are patentably distinct over U.S. Patent No. 4,784,892 to Storey, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,177,370 to Skoog, et al.

Storey, et al. is directed to a laminated microfiber non-woven material. However, Storey, et al. completely fails to disclose or suggest certain limitations of Appellants' pending claims. As indicated in the Office Action, Storey, et al. does not disclose meltblown fibers being present in an amount less than about 8 gsm on the side of a nonwoven web. Final Office Action, pg. 3. Nevertheless, Skoog, et al. was cited in combination with Storey, et al. in an attempt to render obvious claims 1, 32, and 55.

Skoog, et al. is directed to a fabric including a synthetic fiber structure first zone, a synthetic fiber structure second zone, and a short fiber third zone. The Examiner cites Skoog, et al. as disclosing, at column 5, lines 52-53, that meltblown layers 128 and 148 may have a basis weight from about 7 gsm to about 20 gsm, “encompassing the claimed values.” Final Office Action, pg. 3. The Office Action stated that it would have been obvious “to modify the basis weight of the outer layers to be lower since SKOOG et al. has shown that layers with basis weights as low as about 3 gsm will also provide the low linting effect aimed by STOREY.” Final Office Action, pgs. 3-4. In addition, the Examiner stated that “[w]hile the SKOOG reference further provides spunbond layer as the outer layers of the laminate, these are provided for abrasion resistance and strength while the meltblown layers prevent linting by trapping the material of layer 160 (which is equivalent to the nonwoven material of the present invention.” Advisory Action, pg. 2.

A. Storey, et al. teaches away from meltblown fibers in an amount less than about 8 gsm forming the exterior surface of a nonwoven material.

The Federal Circuit has several times expressly addressed the issue of how to evaluate an alleged case of prima facie obviousness to determine whether it has been properly made. For instance, “a prima facie case of obviousness can be rebutted if the applicant can show that the art in any material respect taught away from the claimed invention.” In re Haruna, 249 F.3d 1327,1335 (Fed. Cir. 2001), citing In re Geisler, 116 F.3d 1465, 1469 (Fed. Cir. 1997). A reference may be said to teach away when a person of ordinary skill, upon reading the reference, would be discouraged from following the path set out in the reference, or would be led in a direction divergent from the path that was taken by the applicant. In re Gurley, 27 F.3d 551, 553 (Fed. Cir.

1994). Furthermore, a “prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, ie., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention.” MPEP §2141.02, W.L. Gore & Associates v Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

As confirmed in the Office Action, Storey, et al. does not disclose meltblown fibers being present in an amount less than about **8 gsm** on the exterior of a nonwoven web. Rather, Storey, et al. describes that “[t]he outer layers may for example have a weight of **15 gsm**...but their minimum weight could be about **10 gsm** depending on the requirements of the material.” Col. 2, lines 35-38 (emphasis added). Indeed, the outer layers are described as providing “**durability**” to the product of Storey, et al. and the materials for the outer layers of Storey, et al. should be selected “**depending on the durability**” of such materials. Col. 2, line 7; lines 12-13. One of ordinary skill would simply not look for outer layers having a lower basis weight than the **stated minimum basis weight of 10 gsm** described in Storey, et al. because Storey, et al. has explicitly indicated what the minimum basis weight of the outer layers should be. Thus, Storey, et al. teaches away from meltblown fibers being present in an amount less than about 8 gsm on the exterior surface of a nonwoven web. As such, Appellants submit that all of the currently pending claims patentably define over the cited references.

B. Even if combined, the combination still fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent claims 1, 32, and 55.

The Office Action also fails to recognize that Storey, et al. completely fails to teach, disclose or suggest limitations of independent claims 1, 32, and 55 that are not remedied by the combination with Skoog, et al. Appellants note that it has been long established that in order to establish prima facie obviousness, all of the claimed

limitations must be taught or suggested in the prior art. See, e.g., MPEP § 2143.03, In concerning Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 (CCPA 1974).

As stated in the Office Action, Skoog et al. discloses a fabric that includes three zones: a synthetic fibers structure first zone, a synthetic fibers structure second zone, and short fiber third zone. The Office Action refers to FIG. 3 of Skoog et al. in which “the first and second zones (120 and 140) include a first spunbond web layer 144 and a second meltblown web layer 128, and a second spunbond web layer 144 and a second meltblown web layer 148.” Oct. 6, 2005 Office Action, pg. 3. It was also stated that the first meltblown web layer 128 and second meltblown web layer 148 “help prevent linting.” Final Office Action, pg. 3.

FIG. 3 of Skoog et al. is reproduced below:




FIG. 3

As illustrated in FIG. 3, spunbond web layers 124 and 144 form the exterior layers of the fabric 100 disclosed in Skoog et al. (Col. 5, lines 25-29).

By contrast, independent claims 1, 32, 55 require that meltblown fibers with a basis weight of less than about 8 gsm form the exterior surface of the nonwoven material, tissue product, or wet wipe. Indeed, the present application is directed to

materials having reduced lint and slough. A meltblown “veneer” is applied to at least one side of the material in an amount less than about 8 gsm has been found to greatly reduce lint and slough without substantially affecting the other properties of the material. Application, pg. 4, line 25. Such reduction in lint and slough results from the meltblown fibers forming the exterior surface of the materials in an amount less than about 8 gsm.

Appellants respectfully submit that Skoog et al. does not disclose meltblown fibers forming the exterior surface of a nonwoven material, a tissue product, or a wet wipe in an amount less than about 8 gsm. Rather, the meltblown layers 128 and 148 of Skoog et al. are sandwiched between the fabric 100 and spunbond web layers 124 and 144. Such encapsulated meltblown layers simply do not teach, disclose or suggest the meltblown fibers in an amount less than about 8 gsm that form the exterior surface of the materials of the present application. If anything, both the meltblown layer 128 and the exterior spunbond layer 124 of Skoog et al. should be included in any combination with Storey, et al., in which case the claimed limitations are not disclosed or suggested. As such, Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not met the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness and claims 1, 32, and 55 patentably define over the cited references.

C. No motivation or suggestion exists to combine Storey, et al. and Skoog, et al. as attempted by the Office Action.

As explained by the Federal Circuit, obviousness may only be established by modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention if there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the reference itself or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See e.g., In re Fine,

837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 U.S.P.Q.2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Accordingly, even if all elements of a claim are disclosed in various prior art references, the claimed invention taken as a whole cannot be said to be obvious without some reason given in the prior art why one of ordinary skill would have been prompted to modify the teachings of the references to arrive at the claimed invention. See e.g., In re Regel, 188 U.S.P.Q. 132 (C.C.P.A. 1975). Where no reasonable intrinsic or extrinsic justification exists for the proposed modification, a case of prima facie obviousness will not have been established.

As indicated in the Office Action, Storey, et al. does not disclose meltblown fibers being present in an amount less than about 8 gsm on the exterior surface of a nonwoven web. Skoog, et al. was cited to remedy this deficiency. The Office Action stated that:

[Storey, et al. and Skoog et al.] use meltblown layers of synthetic materials with the purpose of providing the wipes with low linting properties therefore it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the basis weight of the outer layers to be lower since SKOOG et al. has shown that layers with basis weight as low as about 3 gsm will also provide the low linting effect aimed by STOREY.

However, nowhere does Skoog, et al., describe linting properties of meltblown fibers in connection with the basis weight of meltblown fibers applied to the exterior surface of nonwoven webs as required by the presently pending claims. Indeed, as described above, a meltblown “veneer” is applied to at least one side of the material of the presently pending claims that has been found to greatly reduce lint and slough without substantially affecting the other properties of the material. Such reduction in lint

and slough results from the meltblown fibers forming the exterior surface of the materials.

Appellants respectfully submit that as Skoog, et al. does not disclose meltblown fibers forming the exterior surface of a nonwoven material, a tissue product, or a wet wipe, the basis weights identified for the meltblown layers of Skoog, et al. are of no consequence. Rather, the meltblown layers of Skoog, et al. are sandwiched between the fabric and spunbond web layers. The spunbond exterior layers of Skoog, et al. are intended to provide “strength, **durability**, and abrasion resistance to the fabric.” Col. 5, lines 29-31. Once again, to the extent that Storey, et al. describes durability as a desirable characteristic of the material described therein, the spunbond layer 124 of Skoog et al. should be included in any combination with Storey, et al., in which case the claimed limitations are not disclosed or suggested. One of ordinary skill in the art would not look to the basis weight of the sandwiched meltblown layers for a reduction of lint and slough. There would simply be no motivation to combine the basis weight of such sandwiched meltblown layers with the material of Storey, et al. to arrive at the presently pending claims.

Plainly, the Examiner’s only incentive or motivation for so modifying Storey, et al. using the teachings of Skoog, et al. in the manner suggested in the Office Action results from using Appellants’ disclosure as a blueprint to reconstruct the claimed invention out of isolated teachings in the prior art, which is improper under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Appellants note that it is improper to use a patent applicant’s own specification to provide the only suggestion for modifying the prior art. The Federal Circuit has repeatedly warned against using the Applicant's disclosure as a blueprint to reconstruct

the claimed invention out of isolated teachings in the prior art. See Grain Processing Corp. v. American Maize-Products, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1788 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Thus, the mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification. In re Fritch, 12 U.S.P.Q.2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that any such modification of the cited references relies on the impermissible use of hindsight, which cannot be successfully used to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

II. Independent claim 77 is patentably distinct over U.S. Patent No. 4,784,892 to Storey, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,177,370 to Skoog, et al., and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0127937 to Lange, et al. and WO 99/13860 to Richards.

In the Final Office Action, claim 77 was rejected as being unpatentable over Storey, et al. in view of Skoog, et al., in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0127937 to Lange, et al. and WO 99/13860 to Richards.

However, as stated above, Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not met the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness because neither Storey, et al. or Skoog, et al. disclose meltblown fibers forming the exterior surface of a nonwoven material, a tissue product, or a wet wipe in an amount less than about 8 gsm. In addition, even if Storey, et al. or Skoog, et al. did disclose meltblown fibers in an amount of less than about 8 gsm forming the exterior surface of a nonwoven material, there would still be no motivation to combine the basis weight of the sandwiched meltblown layers of Skoog, et al. with the material of Storey, et al. to arrive at the presently pending claims. Indeed, Skoog, et al. teaches away from meltblown fibers in an amount of less than about 8 gsm forming the exterior surface of a nonwoven

material. Thus, there exists no further motivation, incentive or suggestion to further combine Lange, et al. and Richards to correct the deficiencies in the disclosures of Storey, et al. and Skoog, et al. with respect to the rejected claim 77.


Thus, Appellants submit that the combination of Lange, et al. and Richards to the above references is not obvious since there is no motivation, suggestion, or incentive to combine the references, except from the present application itself.

8. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and that the present application is in complete condition for allowance. As such, Appellants respectfully request issuance of the patent.

Respectfully submitted,

DORITY & MANNING, P.A.



Neil M. Batavia
Registration No. 54,599

Date

9/10/07

P.O. Box 1449
Greenville, SC 29602
Telephone: (864) 271-1592
Facsimile: (864) 233-7342

9. CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. (Rejected) A nonwoven material having a first exterior surface and second exterior surface exhibiting reduced lint and slough comprising:

a nonwoven web comprising pulp fibers, the nonwoven web having a first side and a second side; and

meltblown fibers applied to the first side of the nonwoven web, the meltblown fibers being distributed over the surface of the first side of the nonwoven web, the meltblown fibers forming the first exterior surface of the nonwoven material, the meltblown fibers being present in an amount less than about 8 gsm.

2. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 1, wherein the meltblown fibers are present in an amount less than about 6 gsm.

3. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 1, wherein the meltblown fibers are present in an amount less than about 4 gsm.

4. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 1, wherein the meltblown fibers are present in an amount less than about 2 gsm.

5. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 1, wherein the nonwoven web comprises a tissue web.

6. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 1, wherein the nonwoven web has a basis weight of from about 10 gsm to about 120 gsm.

7. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 5, wherein the tissue web has a basis weight of from about 10 gsm to about 35 gsm.

8. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 5, wherein the meltblown fibers are made from a material selected from the group consisting of

styrene-butadiene copolymers, polyvinyl acetate homopolymers, ethylene vinyl acetate copolymers, vinyl acetate acrylic copolymers, ethylene vinyl chloride copolymers, ethylene vinyl chloride-vinyl acetate terpolymers, acrylic polyvinyl chloride polymers, acrylic polymers, waxes, and mixtures thereof.

9. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 5, wherein the tissue web comprises an uncreped, through-air dried web.

10. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 1, wherein the meltblown fibers are applied to the first side and to the second side of the nonwoven web, the meltblown fibers being present on each side of the web in an amount less than about 6 gsm.

11. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 5, wherein the tissue web is made from a stratified fiber furnish, the tissue web including a middle layer positioned between a first outer layer and a second outer layer.

12. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 1, wherein the meltblown fibers comprise continuous filaments having a diameter of less than about 10 microns.

13. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 1, wherein the meltblown fibers comprise continuous filaments having a diameter of less than about 5 microns.

14. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 5, wherein the meltblown fibers are applied to the first side of the nonwoven web in an amount sufficient to reduce the coefficient of friction of the first side of the web.

15. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 5, wherein the tissue web has been formed according to an airlaying process or according to a wet creping process.

16. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 5, wherein the meltblown fibers are applied to the first side of the web in an amount sufficient to reduce slough by at least 30%.

17. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 5, wherein the tissue web contains an anchoring agent that bonds with the meltblown fibers.

18. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 17, wherein the anchoring agent comprises a silicone, a debonder, hydrophobic particles, an emollient, a sizing agent, or a filler particle.

19. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 17, wherein the anchoring agent comprises synthetic fibers present in the tissue web in an amount up to about 10% by weight.

20. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 19, wherein the tissue web is formed from a stratified fiber furnish containing an outer layer that defines the first side of the nonwoven web, the outer layer containing the synthetic fibers.

21. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 1, wherein the nonwoven web comprises a coform web.

22. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 21, wherein the coform web contains pulp fibers in an amount from about 50% by weight to about 80% by weight.

23. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 21, wherein the meltblown fibers are made from a polymer comprising a polyolefin.

24. (Rejected) A wet wipe comprising the nonwoven material as defined in claim 21 and further comprising a wiping solution impregnated into the wipe.

25. (Rejected) A stretch-bonded laminate as defined in claim 21, further comprising a coform web and an elastic layer, the elastic layer positioned between the nonwoven material and the coform web.

26. (Rejected) A wet wipe comprising the stretch-bonded laminate as defined in claim 25 and further comprising a wiping solution impregnated into the wipe.

27. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 1, wherein the pulp fibers comprise softwood fibers.

28. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 21, wherein the coform web comprises polyolefin fibers and pulp fibers and wherein the meltblown fibers comprise polyolefin fibers.

29. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 21, wherein the nonwoven material has a cup crush of less than about 120 g/cm.

30. (Rejected) A wet wipe as defined in claim 24, wherein the wiping solution comprises a silicone-based anionic sulfosuccinate or a long chain aliphatic anionic sulfosuccinate.

31. (Rejected) A wet wipe as defined in claim 30, wherein the wiping solution further comprises an emollient, a solvent, a fragrance, a preservative, a humectant, or mixtures thereof.

32. (Rejected) A tissue product having a first exterior surface and second exterior surface exhibiting reduced lint and slough comprising:

a tissue web comprising pulp fibers, the tissue web having a first side and a second and opposite side; and

meltblown fibers applied to the first side of the tissue web, the meltblown fibers being distributed over the surface of the first side of the tissue web in a manner that reduces lint and slough, the meltblown fibers forming the first exterior surface of the tissue product, the meltblown fibers being present in an amount less than about 6 gsm.

33. (Rejected) A tissue product as defined in claim 32, wherein the tissue web comprises an uncreped, through-air dried web, the tissue web including an air side and a fabric side.

34. (Rejected) A tissue product as defined in claim 33, wherein the meltblown fibers are applied to the air side of the tissue web.

35. (Rejected) A tissue product as defined in claim 32, wherein the tissue web has a basis weight of from about 10 gsm to about 120 gsm.

36. (Rejected) A tissue product as defined in claim 32, wherein the tissue web has a basis weight of from about 10 gsm to about 35 gsm.

37. (Rejected) A tissue product as defined in claim 32, wherein the tissue web has a basis weight of from about 30 gsm to about 80 gsm.

38. (Rejected) A tissue product as defined in claim 32, wherein the meltblown fibers are made from a material selected from the group consisting of styrene-butadiene copolymers, polyvinyl acetate homopolymers, vinyl acetate ethylene copolymers, vinyl acetate acrylic copolymers, ethylene vinyl chloride copolymers, ethylene vinyl chloride-

vinyl acetate terpolymers, acrylic polyvinyl chloride polymers, acrylic polymers, waxes, and mixtures thereof.

39. (Rejected) A tissue product as defined in claim 32, wherein the meltblown fibers are made from a material comprising an ethylene vinyl acetate copolymer.

40. (Rejected) A tissue product as defined in claim 32, wherein the meltblown fibers are made from a material comprising an ethylene vinyl alcohol.

41. (Rejected) A tissue product as defined in claim 32, wherein meltblown fibers are present on the first side and the second side of the tissue web, the meltblown fibers being present in an amount less than about 6 gsm on both sides of the web.

42. (Rejected) A tissue product as defined in claim 32, wherein the tissue web is made from a stratified fiber furnish, the tissue web including a middle layer positioned between a first outer layer and a second outer layer.

43. (Rejected) A tissue product as defined in claim 32, wherein the meltblown fibers comprise continuous filaments having a diameter of less than about 10 microns.

44. (Rejected) A tissue product as defined in claim 32, wherein the meltblown fibers comprise continuous filaments having a diameter of less than about 5 microns.

45. (Rejected) A tissue product as defined in claim 32, wherein the meltblown fibers are applied to the first side of the nonwoven web in an amount sufficient to reduce the coefficient of friction of the first side of the web.

46. (Rejected) A tissue product as defined in claim 32, wherein the tissue web contains an anchoring agent that bonds with the meltblown fibers.

47. (Rejected) A tissue product as defined in claim 46, wherein the anchoring agent comprises a silicone, a debonder, hydrophobic particles, an emollient, a sizing agent, or a filler particle.

48. (Rejected) A tissue product as defined in claim 46, wherein the anchoring agent comprises synthetic fibers present in the tissue web in an amount up to about 10% by weight.

49. (Rejected) A tissue product as defined in claim 48, wherein the tissue web is formed from a stratified fiber furnish containing an outer layer that defines the first side of the nonwoven web, the outer layer containing the synthetic fibers.

50. (Rejected) A tissue product as defined in claim 32, wherein the pulp fibers comprise softwood fibers.

51. (Rejected) A tissue product as defined in claim 42, wherein the outer layers comprise hardwood fibers.

52. (Rejected) A tissue product as defined in claim 32, wherein the meltblown fibers are applied to the first side of the tissue web in an amount less than about 4 gsm.

53. (Rejected) A tissue product as defined in claim 32, wherein the meltblown fibers are applied to the first side of the tissue web in an amount less than about 2 gsm.

54. (Rejected) A tissue product as defined in claim 32, wherein the meltblown fibers are applied to the first side of the tissue web in an amount less than about 1 gsm.

55. (Rejected) A nonwoven material having a first exterior surface and second exterior surface exhibiting reduced lint and slough comprising:

a coform web comprising pulp fibers and polymeric fibers, the coform web having a first side and a second and opposite side; and

meltblown fibers applied to the first side of the coform web, the meltblown fibers being distributed over the surface of the first side of the coform web, the meltblown fibers forming the first exterior surface of the nonwoven material, the meltblown fibers being present in an amount of less than about 8 gsm.

56. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 55, wherein the meltblown fibers are present in an amount less than about 6 gsm.

57. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 55, wherein the meltblown fibers are present in an amount less than about 4 gsm.

58. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 55, wherein the meltblown fibers are present in an amount less than about 2 gsm.

59. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 55, wherein the coform web has a basis weight of from about 10 gsm to about 120 gsm.

60. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 55, wherein the coform web has a basis weight of from about 10 gsm to about 30 gsm.

61. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 55, wherein the meltblown fibers comprise continuous filaments having a diameter of less than about 10 microns.

62. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 55, wherein the meltblown fibers comprise continuous filaments having a diameter of less than about 5 microns.

63. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 55, wherein the meltblown fibers are applied to the first side of the nonwoven web in an amount sufficient to reduce the coefficient of friction of the first side of the web.

64. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 55, wherein the coform web contains pulp fibers in an amount from about 50% by weight to about 80% by weight.

65. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 55, wherein the meltblown fibers are made from a polymer comprising a polyolefin.

66. (Rejected) A wet wipe comprising the coform web as defined in claim 55 and further comprising a wiping solution impregnated into the wipe.

67. (Rejected) A stretch-bonded laminate comprising a coform web as defined in claim 55, a second coform web and an elastic layer positioned between the coform web and the second coform web.

68. (Rejected) A wet wipe comprising the stretch-bonded laminate as defined in claim 67 and further comprising a wiping solution impregnated into the wipe.

69. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 55, wherein the pulp fibers contained in the coform web comprise softwood fibers.

70. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 55, wherein the coform web comprises polyolefin fibers and pulp fibers and wherein the meltblown fibers comprise polyolefin fibers.

71. (Rejected) A nonwoven material as defined in claim 66, wherein the nonwoven material has a cup crush of less than about 120 g/cm.

72. (Rejected) A wet wipe as defined in claim 66, wherein the wiping solution comprises a silicone-based anionic sulfosuccinate or a long chain aliphatic anionic sulfosuccinate.

73. (Rejected) A wet wipe as defined in claim 72, wherein the wiping solution further comprises an emollient, a solvent, a fragrance, a preservative, a humectant, or mixtures thereof.

74. (Rejected) A wet wipe as defined in claim 66, wherein the meltblown fibers decrease lint levels for particles greater than 50 microns by at least about 30%.

75. (Rejected) A wet wipe as defined in claim 66, wherein the meltblown fibers decrease lint levels for particles greater than 50 microns by at least about 40%.

76. (Rejected) A wet wipe as defined in claim 66, wherein the meltblown fibers decrease lint levels for particles greater than 50 microns by at least about 50%.

77. (Rejected) A wet wipe comprising:
a stretch-bonded laminate comprising a first gathered coform web, a second gathered coform web and an elastic layer located in between the first coform web and the second coform web, the first coform web defining a first exterior side of the stretch-bonded laminate and the second coform web defining a second exterior side of the stretch-bonded laminate;

meltblown fibers applied to the first exterior side and to the second exterior side of the stretch-bonded laminate, the meltblown fibers being distributed over the surfaces of the stretch-bonded laminate, the nonwoven fibers being present on each side of the stretch-bonded laminate in an amount less than about 8 gsm; and

a wiping solution impregnated into the stretch-bonded laminate.

78. (Rejected) A wet wipe as defined in claim 77, wherein the meltblown fibers are present on each side of the stretch-bonded laminate in an amount less than about 6 gsm.

79. (Rejected) A wet wipe as defined in claim 77, wherein the meltblown fibers are present on each side of the stretch-bonded laminate in an amount less than about 4 gsm.

80. (Rejected) A wet wipe as defined in claim 77, wherein the meltblown fibers are present on each side of the stretch-bonded laminate in an amount less than about 2 gsm.

81. (Rejected) A wet wipe as defined in claim 77, wherein the first coform web and the second coform web have a basis weight of from about 10 gsm to about 30 gsm.

82. (Rejected) A wet wipe as defined in claim 77, wherein the meltblown fibers comprise continuous filaments having a diameter of less than about 10 microns.

83. (Rejected) A wet wipe as defined in claim 77, wherein the meltblown fibers comprise continuous filaments having a diameter of less than about 5 microns.

84. (Rejected) A wet wipe as defined in claim 77, wherein the coform web contains pulp fibers in an amount from about 50% by weight to about 80% by weight.

85. (Rejected) A wet wipe as defined in claim 77, wherein the meltblown fibers are made from a polymer comprising a polyolefin.

86. (Rejected) A wet wipe as defined in claim 77, wherein the first coform web and the second coform web both comprise a mixture of softwood fibers and polyolefin fibers.

87. (Rejected) A wet wipe as defined in claim 77, wherein the nonwoven material has a cup crush of less than about 120 g/cm.

88. (Rejected) A wet wipe as defined in claim 77, wherein the wiping solution comprises a silicone-based anionic sulfosuccinate or a long chain aliphatic anionic sulfosuccinate.

89. (Rejected) A wet wipe as defined in claim 88, wherein the wiping solution further comprises an emollient, a solvent, a fragrance, a preservative, a humectant, or mixtures thereof.

90. (Rejected) A wet wipe as defined in claim 77, wherein the meltblown fibers decrease lint levels for particles greater than 50 microns by at least about 30%.

91. (Rejected) A wet wipe as defined in claim 77, wherein the meltblown fibers decrease lint levels for particles greater than 50 microns by at least about 40%.

92. (Rejected) A wet wipe as defined in claim 77, wherein the meltblown fibers decrease lint levels for particles greater than 50 microns by at least about 50%.

10. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None

11. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

In re Application of: Close et al.

Serial No.: 10/748,454

Filed: December 30, 2003

Entitled: "Nonwoven Webs Having Reduced Lint and Slough"

Our Reference No.: KCX-485 (19014)

Date of Deposit September 10, 2007

I hereby certify that this paper and all attachments and any fee are being transmitted via the internet to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via the Electronic Filing System.

Heidi M. Lewis

(Typed or printed name of person transmitting paper or fee)

Heidi M. Lewis
(Signature of person transmitting paper or fee)